

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Claims 12, 17-20, 29-30, 42, 47-50, 59-60 and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,048 ("Hudetz") in view of Applicant's alleged admitted prior art.

The rejection of claims 12, 17-20, 29-30, 42, 47-50, 59-60 and 72-74 as allegedly failing to meet the written description requirement is moot because these claims have been amended.

As amended, claims 12, 42, and 72 recite "database is accessed over a network" or "access a database over a network." See, for example, paragraphs 9 and 356, describing providing indices over a network.

As amended, claims 17-20, 47-50 and 73-74 recite that the index is represented as at least part of a sequence of bits. Paragraph 314 provides an example where an index is just part of an N bit binary message, which also includes other data, such as a serial number. This passage in combination with the teaching about indexed based messaging in paragraph 258 and the description of network navigation using indices and other address information at paragraphs 355-367 provide support for an N bit binary sequence including an index and other information like a serial number. The other information may vary, but if the index is the same, the use of the index will provide the same address information.

As amended, claims 29-30 and 59-60 recite language like "access to the database is in response to user input (claims 29-30), and "the database is used to locate information on a network" (claims 30 and 60). An example of accessing in response to user input is at paragraphs 360-361, where the user points and clicks on an object and the user interacts with an electronic order form from the object. Paragraphs 355-367 describe a system and related methods as claimed where the index is used to determine location of information, such as a web page related to the object, on a network such as the World Wide Web.

In view of the above, the written description rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterizations of the Applicant's disclosure as admissions of prior art. Though paragraph 6 uses the term "traditional" in connection with "methods" or "approaches," this was not intended as an admission that the use of an index to a database of URLs was obvious in the combination of elements set forth in the

independent claims. In fact, paragraph 6 is intentionally part of a section of the patent application entitled "Background And Summary of the Invention," which indicates that these teachings were not solely intended or admitted to be background prior art. This is true for both this application as well as the parent application 08/508,083, filed July 27, 1995. Further, the following paragraphs in this section, such as paragraphs 7 and 8, suggest that the context of the invention presents different challenges and issues such that the index approach would not be admitted to be prior art in the combination of elements in the invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify separate prior art, other than the alleged admitted prior art, in the event that he maintains this rejection to support his position that the index based approach is in the prior art.

Finally, Applicant has added new claims 84-95 with elements that are not disclosed or taught in the cited prior art. For example, Hudetz does not teach or suggest: "the data carrier comprises a two dimensional color image and the index is embedded in the color image" nor does Hudetz specifically teach or suggest that "the index is steganographically embedded in the two dimensional color image."

Date: May 13, 2005

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By



Joel R. Meyer
Registration No. 37,677